## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

. 3:00 PM

Plaintiff,

. Telephonic Preliminary . Pretrial Conference

- v -

LARRY HOUSEHOLDER

JEFFREY LONGSTRETH

Case No. 1:20-cr-077-1

NEIL CLARK

Case No. 1:20-cr-077-3

MATTHEW BORGES

Case No. 1:20-cr-077-4

JUAN CESPEDES

Case No. 1:20-cr-077-5

GENERATION NOW, INC.,

Case No. 1:20-cr-077-6

Defendants. . Cincinnati, Ohio

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY S. BLACK, JUDGE

## APPEARANCES (all present by telephone):

For the Plaintiff: EMILY N. GLATFELTER, ESQ.

MATTHEW C. SINGER, ESQ. Assistant U.S. Attorneys

United States Attorney's Office 221 East Fourth Street, Suite 400

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

For Defendant 1, Larry Householder:

MARK B. MAREIN, ESQ.
STEVEN L. BRADLEY, ESQ.
Marein & Bradley
Suite 1800
S26 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Suite 222

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

```
1
    APPEARANCES (Continued):
    For Defendant 2, Jeffrey Longstreth & Defendant 6, Generation
 2
    Now, Inc.:
 3
                           ROBERT F. KRAPENC, ESQ.
 4
                           601 South High Street
                           Columbus, Ohio 43215
 5
    For Defendant 3, Neil Clark:
 6
                           WILLIAM S. IRELAND, II, ESQ.
 7
                           William S. Ireland, Attorney At Law
                           85 Liberty Street
 8
                           Columbus, Ohio 43215
    For Defendant 4, Matthew Borges:
 9
10
                           KARL H. SCHNEIDER, ESQ.
                           McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
                           21 East State Street
11
                           Suite 1700
12
                           Columbus, Ohio 43215
    For Defendant 5, Juan Cespedes:
13
14
                           MARK C. COLLINS, ESQ.
                           KAITLYN C. STEPHENS, ESQ.
15
                           Mark C. Collins Co., LPA
                           492 South High Street, Third Floor
                           Columbus, Ohio 43215
16
17
    Law Clerk:
                           Cristina V. Frankian, Esq.
    Court Reporter:
                           Luke T. Lavin, RDR, CRR
18
                           Potter Stewart U.S. Courthouse
19
                           100 East Fifth Street, Room 103
                           Cincinnati, Ohio
                                             45202
20
                           Telephone: (513) 564-7500
21
22
23
24
25
```

## PROCEEDINGS

2.0

(3:00 PM)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is Judge Timothy S. Black on the record in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio on the criminal docket in the case of United States versus Larry Householder, et al. We are set for a preliminary pretrial conference by phone.

For those who are not participants in the case as lawyers for the parties or the parties, I ask that you mute your microphone so that we don't have excessive feedback.

Non-participants in the case are welcome to be present and listen to the proceedings, but there is no recording to be done nor any comments to be made.

I would like to begin with getting the lawyers to enter their appearances for the record. So in the first instance, who appear as attorneys for the United States of America?

MR. SINGER: Matt Singer is here for the United States, Your Honor. Good afternoon.

MS. GLATFELTER: And Emily Glatfelter for the United States. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

And is it the two of you alone today?

MS. GLATFELTER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

Who appear as the attorneys for Defendant 1, Larry Householder?

```
MR. MAREIN: Attorney Mark B. Marein on behalf of Mr.
 1
    Householder.
 2
                         Good afternoon.
             THE COURT:
 3
                           Steven Bradley on behalf of Mr.
             MR. BRADLEY:
 4
 5
    Householder.
                         Good afternoon, Mr. Bradley.
             THE COURT:
 6
             MR. BRADLEY: Good afternoon.
 7
             MR. OLESKI: And Nicholas Oleski on behalf of Mr.
 8
    Householder.
 9
10
             THE COURT:
                         Good afternoon to the three of you.
        Who appears as the attorney for Defendant Number 2, Jeffrey
11
12
    Longstreth?
             MR. KRAPENC: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Bob Krapenc
13
14
    on behalf of Mr. Longstreth.
15
             THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Krapenc. I'm going to
    ask you about Defendant 6 momentarily, sir.
16
17
        Who appears as the attorney for Defendant 3, Neil Clark?
             MR. IRELAND: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
18
19
    Ireland on behalf of Mr. Neil Clark.
             THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Ireland.
20
        And as to Defendant 4, Matthew Borges?
21
22
             MR. SCHNEIDER: Judge, Karl Schneider on behalf of Mr.
23
    Borges.
                         Good afternoon, Mr. Schneider.
24
             THE COURT:
25
             MR. SCHNEIDER: Good afternoon.
```

THE COURT: Are you by yourself? 1 Mr. Long is out of pocket right 2 MR. SCHNEIDER: I am. 3 now. THE COURT: Very well. 4 5 As to Defendant 5, Juan Cespedes? MR. COLLINS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 6 7 please the Court, I am Mark Collins on behalf of Juan Cespedes. 8 THE COURT: Forgive me for mispronouncing. 9 afternoon, Mr. Collins. 10 And on behalf of Defendant 6, Generation Now, Inc., counsel? 11 12 MR. KRAPENC: Your Honor, good afternoon. Bob Krapenc also representing Generation Now, Inc. 13 14 THE COURT: Good afternoon. The docket does not yet 15 reflect an entry of appearance by you on behalf of Defendant 6, but I know you appeared at the continued initial appearance and 16 17 arraignment. Would you do the Court the courtesy of filing today on the 18 19 docket a short written entry of appearance so we're clear that you represent Defendant 6 as well as Defendant 2, sir. 2.0 21 MR. KRAPENC: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. 23 Are there any lawyers or parties on the line who have not yet identified themselves? 24 25 MR. COLLINS: Your Honor, I'm sorry, it's Mark

```
My associate -- Kaitlyn Stephens -- we thought we had
 1
    Collins.
    filed her entrance as a co-counsel, but she's also on the call.
 2
    But she's in my office, Your Honor, listening.
 3
                         Good afternoon to you as well.
             THE COURT:
 4
 5
        Will you follow through and enter --
             MS. STEPHENS:
                            Good afternoon, Your Honor.
 6
                        Good afternoon.
 7
             THE COURT:
        Will you follow through and reflect her entry of appearance
 8
    on behalf of Defendant 5 as co-counsel by docketing that today?
 9
10
                           Absolutely, Your Honor.
             MR. COLLINS:
                                                     We've been
    trying since about the last hour and a half and having some
11
12
    technical difficulties, but it's my fault. So thank you.
                         If you ever have technical difficulties
13
             THE COURT:
14
    and I can be helpful, let me know.
15
        (Laughter.)
             THE COURT:
16
                         All right. Which lawyer was laughing at
17
    me?
18
        (No response.)
19
             MR. COLLINS:
                            I was laughing at myself, Your Honor.
2.0
             THE COURT:
                        I was teasing.
21
        We have a quorum.
                           There's nobody else who is a lawyer or a
22
    party who has not yet identified themselves; is that correct?
23
        (No response.)
24
             THE COURT:
                         Hearing no response, we have the roll call
25
    set, and the Court is prepared to proceed.
```

Bear with me. I'd like to make a short opening statement and then go around the table and hear from a lawyer on behalf of a party, in turn.

2.0

We are set for a preliminary pretrial conference. We're doing it by phone so as to not drag you all to the courthouse. A preliminary pretrial conference in a criminal matter is often largely a calendaring exercise. We'll see where we are collectively today on calendaring.

Typically I ask the government to start, and I'll tell you what I hope to hear from the government beyond whatever else they want to present that I don't identify. And after I've heard from the government, I'll just go around the table, Defendant 1, 2, 3, et cetera, to get your input.

At a preliminary pretrial conference we have the opportunity to set a calendar, either a full-blown trial calendar or perhaps simply an interim calendar. I ask the government to kick us off, and I will do that momentarily.

Typically I ask the government to confirm my observations, and in this case they include, number one, this is a one-count Indictment charging RICO conspiracy, providing a maximum penalty of up to 20 years in prison, up to three years' supervised release, a fine of various degrees.

I would ask the government -- well, I mentioned the nature of the charge, and it's a single-count Indictment.

I would also inquire of the government as to where you are

on production of discovery. I also will inquire of the government and all parties whether this case appears complex, to wit, given the number of defendants, the nature of the charges, and the volume of discovery, whether the parties believe that this case is complex such that it's unreasonable to expect adequate preparation within the speedy trial limits.

2.0

As to calendaring, the speedy trial calculation the Court has prepared suggests that time started on August 20 but was tolled by an ends of justice finding to November -- or excuse me, September 3, tolled as to all defendants. And so now five days have run. 65 days remain if we're doing a 70-day clock, which would require us to commence trial by November 13th, a Friday. And accordingly, if we set a full-blown trial calendar with a trial date, the Court would propose the trial date of 11/9, commencing 11/9/2020, a Monday, rather than the Friday of that week as specifically required.

So momentarily I'm going to stop talking and ask the government to affirm that I've stated the charge correctly and the potential penalty correctly. I'm going to ask where you are on production of discovery, where you are on your opinion as to whether this is a complex case, and anything else you want to bring to the Court's attention. And then I'm going to go and speak to each of the defense lawyers, defendant's single lawyer, to get a sense for your reaction to those same items and anything else you wish to bring to my attention.

I do acknowledge that Defendants 2, 3, 4 and 5 all have motions for discovery pending. To some extent each motion requests, among other things, production of *Jencks* material, which the government is not required to provide at this time and the Court will not yet so order. But otherwise I assume that after I hear from the government with the status of discovery production, subject to the government's duty to supplement, that perhaps those motions for discovery are effectively moot.

But as to the government's position at the preliminary pretrial conference today, would you kick us off and be responsive to my inquiries and state anything else you wish to state at this stage.

Who will be heard on behalf of the government?

MR. SINGER: Yes, Your Honor. This is Matt Singer for the government.

THE COURT: Very well.

2.0

MR. SINGER: Starting with number one, Your Honor, the charge and the penalty that you recited are correct.

As for discovery, defendants have been provided two rounds of discovery so far. Discovery is voluminous, and we're still receiving and processing grand jury subpoena returns as well as search warrant returns, and we will be continuing to provide those in the following weeks on a rolling basis.

THE COURT: I need to interrupt and clarify. I may

have misheard you, but is it true that the government has begun to produce discovery and has done so in two separate waves to date?

MR. SINGER: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And you have additional discovery to produce, and you intend to do that expeditiously?

MR. SINGER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And you're simply going to do it on a rolling basis?

MR. SINGER: That's correct. We have served a number of subpoenas prior to the Indictment, and we are still in the process of receiving those returns, and we will be processing them and producing them in discovery expeditiously on a rolling basis.

THE COURT: And without tying you down but just trying to get a sense for where we are, when do you think you will have achieved essentially full production but for your ongoing responsibility to supplement, a week, a month, an hour? What do you think?

MR. SINGER: Well, we're hopeful in the next -- within the next month. We do -- in addition, some of it is out of our control in that third parties are producing these documents to us, and then we're going to need to turn those around and produce them to the defendants. So we might need additional time, but we're hopeful that they will be coming in soon, and

we will turn them around as quickly as we can.

THE COURT: And is it fair to infer that you have done major production of the discovery in your possession and, as third-party production occurs, you're going to simply produce it as expeditiously as you can?

MR. SINGER: Yes, that is true, Your Honor. We do have some discovery that we have had that we are getting -- we have gotten in the last couple weeks that we are in the process of turning around. So as we -- like I said, as we get it in, we will be producing it out.

THE COURT: And when do you think you're going to have most of the production of discovery accomplished but for discovery that you have not yet received responses from for the third parties?

MR. SINGER: I would say hopeful that by the last week in September or the first week in October.

THE COURT: Very well. I interrupted you. You were going to proceed. Where are --

Go ahead.

MR. SINGER: I would note, Your Honor, that in addition to the grand jury subpoenas, we served a number of search warrants, and we are in the process of processing those returns as well, which, of course, we will produce in discovery. A lot of them are -- the substance of those -- some of them, for example, we have produced back to the defendants

Tell me

1 in their form, but we will be performing filter reviews of those returns and then producing those on a rolling basis as 2 well. And that will likely take more time than the grand jury 3 subpoenas, because we -- the filter review process is just 4 5 going to take time. Understood. I'm simply trying to get a 6 THE COURT: 7 sense for where you are. 8 It's still your turn in the -- whatever it is, in the tunnel or in this conference. What did you make of complexity? 9 10 The government would agree that this is a MR. SINGER: complex case, Your Honor, given the number of defendants, the 11 nature of the prosecution. It's a complicated racketeering 12 matter involving multiple corporate entities. So the 13 government would agree that this is a complex matter. 14 15 THE COURT: Very well. Are there other issues you wanted to bring to my attention before I start to go around the 16 17 balance of the table? 18 MR. SINGER: No, Your Honor. Just that the government agrees with the Court's speedy trial clock calculation. 19 20 THE COURT: Very well. MR. SINGER: Other than that, nothing else for now. 21 22 THE COURT: Very well. 23 Well, let's go around the table. Who will be heard on

MR. MAREIN: I will, Your Honor, Mark Marein.

behalf of Defendant 1, Larry Householder?

24

25

when I need to speak.

2.0

THE COURT: This would be your moment in time today.

MR. MAREIN: Thank you. I appreciate it.

In terms of the penalty provisions that were suggested by both the Court and agreed to by the prosecutor, we would concur in that.

In terms of the discovery, upon our submission of our entry of appearance and substitution of counsel, we sent a discovery request to the government. The government has since, and rather expeditiously, supplied us with what I'll deem to be three tiers of discovery. That was right before the Memorial Day -- or, I'm sorry, Labor Day weekend, and suffice it to say, we are just now beginning to look at it. It appears to be, at least from that initial disclosure, quite a bit of discovery. And we've also heard, as the prosecutor said, that there is likely to be some additional disclosures.

As far as the matter of complexity, I think the Indictment and, naturally, all that surrounds this case speaks to the issue of complexity, and we would therefore concur that the speedy trial provision would, under such circumstances, not satisfy the ends of justice, and we would be inclined to be filing a motion, hopefully to be joined in by all parties, that the matter is complex and ought to be scheduled sometime in the future.

As far as bringing other matters to the Court's attention,

I don't believe this would play into it given my last statement about complexity, but Mr. Bradley, my partner and co-counsel, we are scheduled in U.S. District Court in Youngstown, Ohio, on November 9th to proceed in a federal drug case, and that is a date that probably is in granite at this point, given the continuances and the pandemic.

THE COURT: Very well.

2.0

MR. MAREIN: That would -- and that's it.

THE COURT: Well, let's have a little dialogue to clarify. You tend to agree that the case is complex and it would be unreasonable to expect adequate preparation within the speedy trial time limits; is that right?

MR. MAREIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And are you seeking a continuance for adequate time to, among other things, review the voluminous discovery and consider motion practice?

MR. MAREIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Very well. And before I let you off the hook, when do you think you would have had time to adequately review discovery and consider motion practice?

MR. MAREIN: Truth be told, Judge, I don't know if I'm in a position to practically analyze that.

THE COURT: Fair enough.

MR. MAREIN: I can tell you that we just started looking at what was presented, and the three of us just got off

the telephone maybe 15 minutes ago with Nick Oleski indicating "There's a lot of materials here." So in that regard I would have to say months.

THE COURT: Well, the Court will weigh in in due course. I'm simply trying to gauge your perceptions and your needs.

Was there more you wanted to bring to my attention before I move to Defendant Number 2?

MR. MAREIN: None, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Very well.

2.0

On behalf of Jeffrey Longstreth, counsel?

MR. KRAPENC: Your Honor, I would also agree that this is a complex case. I would ask for a continuance to have the adequate time to review the discovery, decide if and what motions need to be filed. I have gone through a good bit of the discovery, and I agree that it is going to take a fair bit of time to go through, I'll call it, the last tier, the last batch of discovery that I received last week. I would join in the motion for a continuance.

THE COURT: Very well. Concise and on point.

Mr. Ireland, what's your perspective and that of your client as we begin this journey?

MR. IRELAND: Your Honor, I'm going to concur as to acknowledgment of penalties, also to the voluminous nature of the discovery and to the complexity. And if I may, I would

1 also join similarly in terms of the continuance, Your Honor. THE COURT: Very well. 2 And on behalf of Defendant 4, Matthew Borges, counsel? 3 MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, Your Honor, Karl Schneider. 4 5 Yeah, we agree that this is a complex case. We would join in the motion to continue outside the speedy trial parameters 6 7 that are set for November. And Mr. Singer was correct. The government heretofore has 8 provided at least myself and my co-counsel with two waves of 9 10 discovery, the process which is -- of reviewing is ongoing as 11 we speak. 12 THE COURT: Very well. And, Mr. Collins, on behalf of Defendant 5? 13 14 MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 We would agree that it's a complex case. We received our first batch through FedEx last week, and then we actually 16 17 received another batch this morning at around 11:00 o'clock. It's very voluminous in terms of motion practice, and it would 18 19 be difficult at this point in time to set a deadline. We are in agreement with a continuance and the complexity of the case. 2.0 21 THE COURT: Very well. Thank you. 22 And counsel on behalf of Defendant 6, Generation Now, Inc., also on behalf of Defendant 2, anything further specifically on 23 behalf of Defendant 6, Generation Now, Inc.? 24 25 MR. KRAPENC: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Very well.

2.0

Back to the government. The Court's prepared to make a finding that given the number of defendants, the nature of the charges and the volume of discovery, the Court finds that this case is complex such that it's unreasonable to expect adequate preparation within the speedy trial limits, and failure to grant a continuance, as requested by all defendants, would result in a miscarriage of justice.

Does the government concur, object, wish to be heard? And then when do you think it would be timely for me to summon the lawyers to another conference for further harassment?

MS. GLATFELTER: Your Honor, this is Emily Glatfelter.
THE COURT: Yes.

MS. GLATFELTER: We concur that it's complex. But in terms of the timeline, the discovery, I would just like to point out to the Court that we've made a lot of effort on our part to put the discovery in organized tiers and make sure that it's easy to follow and easy to differentiate between the tiers. And so I do expect that, although we will make best efforts to get this done within a month, I think realistically it may take a little bit longer. And so I would suggest a follow-up status conference towards the end of October to find out where we are in discovery, hopefully close to if not finished, or any difficulties we've encountered, and then find out the status of review and what defense counsel need in terms

of time.

THE COURT: Very well. I appreciate your statement about the work you've done to produce the voluminous discovery to date in as manageable a format as you can, and that's entirely consistent with my experience with you and your office.

On behalf of defendant Householder, do you think it's reasonable or timely for me to set another status conference by phone toward the end of October?

MR. MAREIN: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: And on that date will you work toward being able to tell me where you are on receipt of discovery and, more specifically, where you are on a proposed motion deadline?

MR. MAREIN: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Very well.

On behalf of Defendants 2 and 6, I'm horrible on names, but it appears to be -- why don't you state your name again, Robert.

MR. KRAPENC: Your Honor, it's Bob Krapenc.

THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Krapenc, the same inquiry

I just made of Mr. Marein.

MR. KRAPENC: Your Honor, I agree that the date at the end of October should give me enough time to have a very good idea of what motions I will need to file, and at which time I

will need to do that. 1 THE COURT: Very well. 2 Mr. Ireland, on behalf of Neil Clark? 3 MR. IRELAND: I will abide, Your Honor. I'll ensure 4 5 to be as ready as possible. 6 THE COURT: Very well. 7 On behalf of Defendant Borges? MR. SCHNEIDER: Your Honor, Karl Schneider. 8 Yes, we're comfortable with a late October status 9 10 conference call with the Court, et cetera. THE COURT: Very well. 11 12 And Mr. -- Bob, you have been heard on Defendant 6's 13 perspective as well? Yes. Yes on Defendant 5 to both, Your 14 MR. COLLINS: 15 Honor: Mr. Cespedes. This is Mark Collins. THE COURT: Very well. 16 Thank you. And Defendant 6 has been heard, counsel; is that right? 17 18 MR. KRAPENC: Yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: Very well. 2.0 My law clerk's on the line. I should have said that up front. I apologize. 21 22 Ms. Frankian, are you able to look at the calendar and begin the bidding on a date and time in late October for a 23 status conference by phone? 24 We're all going to have to make an effort to make ourselves 25

```
available.
 1
 2
        From the Court's perspective, what date and time would you
    first propose, Ms. Frankian?
 3
             THE LAW CLERK: October 30th at 2:30.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Does that work for the government, or can
 6
    you make it work?
 7
             MS. GLATFELTER:
                              Yes, Your Honor.
 8
             THE COURT:
                         On behalf of defendant Householder, the
    same inquiry.
 9
10
                          That works.
             MR. MAREIN:
                         On behalf of Defendants 2 and 6, the same
11
             THE COURT:
12
    inquiry.
             MR. KRAPENC: Yes, Your Honor, that works fine.
13
14
    you.
             THE COURT: Mr. Ireland?
15
                           That will work, Your Honor.
16
             MR. IRELAND:
17
             THE COURT:
                         On behalf of Defendant 4, Borges?
18
             MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, Your Honor, that's fine.
19
    date's fine.
20
             THE COURT: Mr. Collins, on behalf of Defendant 5?
             MR. COLLINS: Absolutely, Your Honor.
21
22
             THE COURT:
                         And Defendant 6 counsel has already
    weighed in and will make himself available; is that right?
23
24
             MR. KRAPENC: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Very well.
25
```

Well, one more time for the record, we're going to set this 1 for a status conference by phone. 2 And, Ms. Frankian, help me. October 30 at 2:30; is that 3 correct? 4 5 THE LAW CLERK: Yes, Judge. THE COURT: Very well. We'll act accordingly. 6 7 The Court has made an ends of justice finding deeming the 8 case complex, and time is tolled between now and the new date. And on the new date all participants will be in a position to 9 10 indicate where we are on receipt and review of discovery and be 11 in a position to propose to the Court an appropriate motion 12 deadline. With that, we may well have accomplished what we need to 13 14 accomplish today. If there's more, though, tell me. 15 Is there more today from the government's perspective? No, Your Honor. 16 MR. SINGER: 17 Not from the government. MS. GLATFELTER: 18 THE COURT: Very well. 19 On behalf of defendant Householder? 2.0 MR. MAREIN: No. On behalf of Defendants 2 and 6? 21 THE COURT: 22 MR. KRAPENC: No, Your Honor. Thank you. On behalf of counsel for Neil Clark, Mr. 23 THE COURT: 24 Ireland? 25 MR. IRELAND: Ireland. Nothing further here, Your

Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Very well. On behalf of Defendant 4, counsel? 3 MR. SCHNEIDER: Nothing, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: And on behalf of Defendant 5, Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 6 7 THE COURT: Very well. 8 Well, we have completed what we needed to do today. Court will docket the status report date, and we'll be ready 9 10 for you on October 30 at 2:30 by phone. With that, I want to thank you all for participating, 11 12 calling in timely. I want you to stay safe. And I am going to adjourn now by saying goodbye and hanging up. 13 Thank you, counsel. Goodbye. 14 Thank you, Your Honor. 15 MR. KRAPENC: MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Very well. (Proceedings concluded at 3:30 PM.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

I, Luke T. Lavin, RDR, CRR, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. s/Luke T. Lavin Luke T. Lavin Official Court Reporter